

# THE CHINESE RECORDER AND MISSIONARY JOURNAL.

VOL. 2.

FOOCHOW, JUNE, 1869.

No. 1

## BUDDHISM IN CHINA.

BY T. WATTERS.

### CHAPTER I.

#### *Historical Summary.*

The history of Buddhism in China presents attractions no less to the student of Chinese history than to the student of Buddhism itself. So strange have been its fortunes and so varied its career in this country that, apart from all other considerations, it must be interesting and instructive to all who think seriously about religion or the welfare of humanity. Nor can it be said that this is a subject which has been already exhausted. Mr. Edkins is almost alone, so far as my knowledge extends, in having studied profoundly and related carefully the history of Buddhism in China. The object and scope of the following pages are different from those of Mr. Edkins, but my obligations to him will be apparent to all who have read his learned and invaluable Notices.<sup>1</sup>

It seems to be impossible now to ascertain the precise date of the introduction of this religion into China. The *Chêng-tzü-t'ung* 正字通 rejects the commonly received opinion which assigns it to the reign of Ming Ti (A. D. 58 to 76) of the East Han Dynasty. This work<sup>2</sup> says that under the Ch'in 秦 Dynasty (B. C. 246-202), Shi-li-fang and other foreign ascetics came to China, and that *Shih Hwangti*—the emperor who has made himself forever famous by the burning of the ancient

books, and the massacre of the learned men—regarding them as strange and outlandish objects, put them in prison. During the night a golden man broke open the doors, and allowed them to escape. Moreover Lie-tzü 列子, a philosopher who lived near the end of the Chow dynasty, says that in the time of King Mu (B. C. 1001 to 946) there came to China from the extreme west a magician who was able to go into water and fire, pass through metal and stone, and do many other marvellous things. This man has by some been identified with the historical Buddha, but wrongly. The same philosopher represents Confucius as saying with emotion to a *T'ai tsai* 太宰 or high officer, named Shang, that there was a *Shêng cho* 聖者, or godlike man, among the people of the West. There are, however, doubts as to the genuineness of the remark; and the description given of the conduct of the individual does not at all correspond to the truth about the actual Buddha.<sup>3</sup>

In the reign of king Wu 武 (B. C. 140-86) of the West Han Dynasty, a gold image of Buddha was brought to China, and set up in the Sweet Spring Temple 甘泉宮. This served as the model according to which the images of Buddha were afterwards made.<sup>4</sup> King Ai 哀 of the same dynasty (B. C. 6 to A. D. 1) sent learned men to search for images and books of the Buddhist religion, but they returned without having reached their destination.

<sup>1</sup> The Notices of Buddhism in China appeared in the *North China Herald* during the year 1854, beginning with No. 196. They were reprinted in an Almanack published by the office of the above newspaper, but they are well worthy of being revised and published again.

<sup>2</sup> See Kanghsí's Dictionary, under the character 佛.

<sup>3</sup> See Lie-tzü's Works—the 周穆王篇 and 仲尼篇.

<sup>4</sup> Kanghsí's Dictionary, l. c. Compare also the 文獻通考 by Ma Tuan-lin, ch. 226.

Whether, accordingly, we accept or reject the statements of Lie-tzü, we must, I think, agree with the author of the *Chêng-tzü-t'ung*, that long before the time of *Han Ming Ti* the existence of the Buddha had been known in China. Nor can the apparent ease and readiness with which this emperor's dream was interpreted be explained otherwise. The vision of a gold man more than ten feet high appeared to him one night, and on relating the circumstance to his courtiers, they asserted that the gold man was the divine Buddha of the West.<sup>5</sup> We may therefore coincide with Edkins and others in their opinion that it was during the third century B. C. that Buddhism began to be propagated in China.

It does not seem, however, to have made much progress until the time of *Ming Ti* (A. D. 58 to 76), who, on learning that there was in a country to the west a god named Buddha, sent Ts'ai-yin and Ch'in-ching to India to learn the doctrines, and obtain the books and images of this religion. These men returned with forty-two chapters of Buddhist Sutras<sup>6</sup> and images, and with *Shipmadanga* and some other foreign monks. The monks were located at the capital in the *Hung-lu-ssu* 鴻臚寺, an office corresponding somewhat to the present Board of Ceremonies. One of them, Chu-fa-lan 竺法蘭, translated the *Shi-chu-ching 十佳經*, or Sutra of the Ten Restings. In the reign of *Chang Ti* (76 to 89), the Chief of the *Ch'u* 楚 kingdom became a devoted follower of Buddhism, and many more books were imported. Eighty years afterwards a Parthian monk arrived at Lo-yang with a collection of Sutras, some of which he translated with great intelligence and perspicuity. More monks arrived in the reign of *Ling Ti* (168 to 190) from the country of the *Getæ* and from India,

<sup>5</sup> See the *Yuan-chien-lei-han* 淵鑑類涵 ch. 316.

<sup>6</sup> Mr. Edkins speaks of "the Classic of 42 Sections." See *N. C. H.*, No. 200. The Buddhist Sutra known by this name has been translated by the Rev. E. S. Beal. See *Ma Tuan-lin*, ch. 226.

and translated the *Nirvâna* and other Sutras with great spirit and fidelity.

In A. D. 220, China became divided into the three kingdoms of Han, Wei, and Wu, known collectively as the San Kuo or Three Kingdoms. The princes of Wu became followers of Buddha, and a western monk brought a collection of Sutras to the Capital, part of which he also translated. The Chiefs of Wei, the Northern Kingdom, also favoured Buddhism, and their subjects were allowed to become monks and nuns.<sup>7</sup> Under the rule of *Shao Ti* (254 to 260), the third of the Wei princes, a Chinese traveller went to Khotan, and obtained ninety chapters of Sutras, which he translated thirty years afterwards, on his return to Honan, giving his work the title *Fang-yuan-p'an-jching* 放元般若經.<sup>8</sup>

The Chin 訇 Dynasty succeeded the Three Kingdoms, and reigned not very gloriously from A. D. 265 to 420. Under the first sovereign, a monk from the country of the *Getæ*, who had travelled to the West and obtained several Buddhist classics, arrived at Lo-yang, and proceeded to the work of translation. From this time the advance of the foreign religion was very rapid, and we begin to read of Chinese becoming celebrated for their knowledge of the sacred books. About the year 335, the subjects of the After *Ch'ao* 後趙 state were allowed to enter the service of Buddha. There seems to have been a considerable amount of religious excitement about this time, partly due to the influence of an Indian missionary monk, Budojinga. Nearly fifty years afterwards, a king of this dynasty had a relic deposited within the palace enclosure, and a pagoda built over it. The progress of Buddhism, however, was not unopposed. When the people of *Ch'ao* were allowed to become religieux, and

<sup>7</sup> Ma Tuan-lin, i. c. This is, I think, the first notice of the Chinese being allowed to take the vows According to another authority, however, it was under *Ming Ti* of the Han Dynasty that Chinese first became monks. See *Yuan-chien*, &c., ch. 317

<sup>8</sup> Edkins, however, gives *K'eang* instead of *Yuan*. See *N. C. H.*, No. 203. There is no doubt, I think that this is the correct reading.

were emulous in the erection of temples and monasteries, a high mandarin named *Wang Tu* 王度 made the matter the subject of a memorial.<sup>9</sup> He represented to His Majesty that the Buddha was a foreign deity, and ought not to be worshipped by the Chinese—that on the introduction of Buddhism into China under the Han Dynasty, only foreigners had been allowed to build temples for the worship of their deity, but no Chinaman took the vows. The Wei princees, he said, had continued the rules of the Han Dynasty, and he prayed that the people of Ch'ao should be forbidden to frequent the Buddhist temples, or burn incense, or offer worship to the Buddha, that so the canonical ceremonies might be observed. It was about this time that a Chinese named *Wei Tao-an* 衛道安 flourished in one of the northern states. He was a man of great intellectual power, and a devoted admirer of Buddhism. For ten years he applied himself to the study of the Sutras, and was one of the first of the native Chinese to make himself master of them.<sup>1</sup> He revised and corrected the translations which the foreigners had previously made, and added clear and explicit interpretations. A number of disciples attached themselves to him, and these he afterwards sent in different directions over the country to propagate the Law. He himself proceeded to Ch'ang-an, where the usurper *Fu-chien* 柏堅 of Ch'in received him with great respect. Hearing of the religious fame of the Hindoo missionary *Kumarajiva*, who was at Ku-tzu—a country near Tibet—*Tao-an* persuaded the prince to send for him; and *Kumarajiva*, not ignorant of the Chinese Buddhist, bowed to the prince's order. It was not however until many years afterwards, in the reign of *An Ti* (397 to 419), that the Hindoo monk arrived in China; when he found to his great sorrow that *Tao-an* had died twenty years before. The Prince of Ch'in received him with great respect, and appointed him Teacher of the

Kingdom 國師, corresponding somewhat to an Archbishop. *Kumarajiva* now applied himself assiduously to the propagation of Buddhism, and with the assistance of a large number of other monks translated many of the sacred books. The prince collected the monks and priests in a pavilion in his garden, to hear the Master of the Law expound the Sutras. He himself helped in the work of translation and correction, reading the old versions while *Kumarajiva* read the original. Thus the translations now made became the best, and they have in many cases remained ever since the standard editions.

This dynasty presents yet another name illustrious in the annals of Buddhism in China. In the year 399, the celebrated *Fa-hsien* 法顯, accompanied by *Hwei-ching* and several others, set out from Ch'ang-an on his pilgrimage to India in search of the Buddhist "prohibitions and regulations." Few books of travel are more interesting than the short work which he wrote on his return to his native place fifteen years afterwards.<sup>2</sup> In this he gives a brief and succinct account of the countries through which he passed—chiefly, however, from a religious point of view, dwelling almost exclusively on the way in which Buddhism fared in each. The pilgrims crossed the desert of Gobi—a distance of 1,500 *li*—in seventeen days. This was the beginning of the perils and troubles of the journey. The desert was haunted by wicked demons—hot winds abounded which utterly destroyed everything that encountered them—there were no birds in the air, and no animals on the ground. As far as the eyes could reach there was not a path, and the only landmarks were the bleached bones of former travellers. From this dismal region, *Fa-hsien* and his companions passed on westward through Tatar (*Hu* 胡) tribes, each with a peculiar dialect, but the *religieux* of which all conversed in Sanscrit, and

<sup>9</sup> See the *Yuan-chien-lei-han*, ch. 316.

<sup>1</sup> Ma Tuan-lin, l. c.

<sup>2</sup> *Fa-hsien's* work, the *Fo-kuo-chi*, has been translated into French by Remusat, and from the French by Mr. Laidlay into English. A new English translation has been recently made by Mr. Beal.

studied the sacred books in that language. Thence they proceeded northward through various countries; but the exact route which they took cannot be ascertained. They entered India, however, from the west side of the Punjab, and proceeded across the country to Oude and the northwest part of Benjal, visiting on the way numerous places consecrated by Buddhistic memories and associations. After sojourning in these regions for some time, Fa-hsien reached a seaport at the mouth of the Ganges, where he embarked for Ceylon. Here also he remained for some time, still pursuing his studies. But he was now alone—his former companions having all separated from him or died on the way—and longings for his fatherland made him anxious to depart. He had, as he says pathetically, only the company of his shadow; and on the sight of a Chinese fan, his eyes filled with tears.<sup>3</sup> Accordingly he embarked with his sacred books, &c., on board a merchant vessel bound for China, which he finally reached after many hardships. It was in the year 414 that he arrived, and he must have found that Buddhism had made great progress in the time he was away. It was now favoured by the rulers, monasteries were multiplied, and nine-tenths of the households had embraced its doctrines. Shortly after Fa-hsien's arrival, another Chinese—Chíméng 智猛—set out on a pilgrimage, and obtained the Nirvana Sutra. Monks now arrived from India and other places also; and it appears that at the end of the Chin Dynasty, Buddhism had made China well acquainted with the surrounding countries which had adopted that religion.

On the extinction of the Chin Dynasty, the empire was again divided into several petty principalities; and this state of confusion lasted for more than one hundred and sixty years. A native dynasty predominated in the country south of the Yang-tzü, and one of foreign origin prevailed, in the regions north of that river. Hence this is known as the period of the Southern and Northern Dynasties. We will first fol-

low the fortunes of Buddhism in the Southern provinces and then see how it fared in those of the North.

During the short-lived Sung dynasty, which bore sway over the Southern states from A. D. 420 to 479, Buddhism seems to have prospered well, notwithstanding a considerable amount of opposition. It is to this and the preceding dynasty that the Confucianists usually refer its complete establishment in the country. Foreign princes now heard of the wonderful progress which religion had made in China, and sent ambassadors to the Sung emperors, bearing letters full of the praises of these rulers, as well on account of the general splendour of their state, as on account of their zeal for the Law. From Annam, Ceylon, and several places in India, these embassies came, for some time almost yearly, bringing offerings of pure gold, and parrots, and sandal-wood, and occasionally, something precious in the eyes of a Buddhist.<sup>4</sup> Already, however, degeneracy had begun to show itself, and the charges which Taoists and Confucianists were eager to make against the professors of religion were not without foundation. This falling away was chiefly manifested in the lives of the men and women who had taken the vows of celibacy and chastity.

Of the history of Buddhism under the Ch'i Dynasty, which ruled only twenty-two years (from A. D. 479 to 501), we have little information. The second and only good emperor of the five, who during this short period ascended the throne, was a friend to the monks and nuns, and the crimes and troubles of the remaining sovereigns scarcely left them leisure to think of religion.

Under the Liang Dynasty, which succeeded Ch'i in the South, and lasted from A. D. 502 to 553, Buddhism still continued to flourish. On the accession of the first emperor of this dynasty, however, the Confucianists may have thought that it would suffer severely. Wu Ti began his reign as a zealous fol-

<sup>3</sup> Fo-kuo-chi, near the end.

<sup>4</sup> See the Sung Shu, ch. 57. Julien, Mélanges de Géographie Asiatique, &c., p. 156. Edkins, N. C. H., No. 200.

lower and admirer of Confucius.<sup>5</sup> He raised a temple to the Sage's honour, and in many other ways gave great hopes that the old doctrines would again prevail, but these hopes were to be woefully disappointed. The emperor became as enthusiastic a Buddhist as he had been Confucianist. He rebuilt the Ch'ang-kan monastery,<sup>6</sup> expounded the sacred books in public, and on three occasions resigned the cares and glory of the throne for the seclusion of the cell. Exceedingly stupid was Wu Ti, says the Confucianist annotator in the history of the dynasty; and certainly religion did not, as another Confucianist has remarked, save him from an ignominious death. During his reign, and about the year 520, the great Buddhist reformer P'u-t'i-ta-mo, or Bodhidharma, arrived in South China from India. This man, the twenty-eighth patriarch from Mahakasyapa, originated the school of Contemplatists in China. He pointed to man's heart and nature as the important things in the attainment of Buddhaship, and made no account of the written books. Liang Wu Ti had summoned him to the Court at Nanking; but not being sufficiently encouraged, or from some other reason, Bodhidharma declined to stay at Nanking, and crossed the Yang-tzü to take up his residence in the Northern kingdom.<sup>7</sup> The successor of this sovereign seems to have been attached to the Taoists; but under Ching Ti, the last of the dynasty, Buddhism was again in the ascendancy, and this ruler made the Taoists become monks.<sup>8</sup>

Under the Chén Dynasty, which flourished for only a few years, Buddhism still continued to be in favour. Wu Ti, the first Emperor, in the second year of his reign (A. D. 558), took the vows, and became an inmate of the

Ta-chuang-yen monastery.<sup>9</sup> Not long after this China became again united; so we must now turn back to see how the Law had fared all this time in the states North of the Yang-tzü.

It was near the end of the fourth century of our era, and under the last sovereigns of the Chin Dynasty, that Wei erected itself into an independent kingdom, and assumed an ascendancy among the northern states. Some of its early princes seem to have been rather unfriendly towards Buddhism, or at least to have punished its faults and excesses with great severity. We find T'ai Wu, the third ruler, classing monks and sorcerers together, and forbidding the private maintenance of both. Afterwards, about the year 447, he caused large number of the *religieux* to be put to death, and demolished many monasteries. He also burnt the sacred books and destroyed the images, threatening the punishment of death to all who would continue to serve Buddha, and make images of him in clay or metal—being thus the first, as the Confucian annotator remarks, to dare the power of the foreign deity for good and for evil. In vain, however, were all his efforts. His own son and successor was a friend to Buddhism, and under him it flourished again. Hsuan Wu, who was contemporary with Liang Wu Ti, was also a devoted follower of the heretical religion. He publicly expounded the Sutras, and built a monastery with accommodation for 3,000 monks who had come over from India. It was in Lo-yang (near the modern Ho-nan-foo) that Buddhism was now most prosperous. Between that city and Yen-chang-chow (the present Yung-chow in Hunan) 13,000 monasteries were counted. In the year 518, the Wei empress, a very accomplished but profligate woman, sent Sung-yün 宋雲 and Hui-shēng 慧生 to the West in search of Buddhist books. These two travellers crossed the Chi-ling mountains, and thence proceeded westward for two years until they

<sup>5</sup> See Tung-chien-kang-mu, ch. 30.

<sup>6</sup> Mr. Edkins writes the "Ch'ang-tsien" monastery. See N. C. H., No. 301.

<sup>7</sup> For further particulars about Bodhidharma and the schools which arose from his teachings see Edkins, N. C. H., No. 200, and the preface to the

Wu tēng-hui-yuan. 五燈會元.

He is said to have crossed the Yang-tzü on a raft of reeds, and to have sat for the rest of his life gazing on a wall, which after nine years bore the impression of his shadow.

<sup>8</sup> Tung-chien, &c., ch. 33.

<sup>9</sup> Tung-chien, &c., ch. 30, near the end. The annotator is not slow to comment on the impropriety of a regicide joining a religion whose founder hated bloodshed.

reached the country of Kan-lo (identified with Kandahar). Sung-yün obtained one hundred and seventy Buddhist works, and returned with them to China. He published an account of his travels, which has been translated by Professor Neumann, through from a faulty text, according to M. Julien, who is preparing a new translation. This empress, known as Hu-eai-hou 胡太后, built several magnificent temples and monasteries, and a costly pagoda more than ninety feet high.<sup>1</sup> In other respects also she advanced the cause of Buddhism; and had she borne a less sullied name, she might have become one of its brightest ornaments.

Some time before this, a monk had caused a tumult in Chi-chou 冀州, of the Wei kingdom, by giving people as medicine a drug which he had prepared, and which caused oblivion in the mind of the recipient.<sup>2</sup> This commotion assumed such a magnitude as to necessitate the sending of a high officer with a military force to reduce the place to order. This is, I think, one of the first recorded instances of Buddhists in China having recourse to quackery and charlatanism. We learn also that at this period the monks were accustomed to reside in congregations, as many as five hundred being sometimes collected together in one monastery; whereas in early times the rule had been that only one *religieux* was to reside in any one building. These monks, says a Confucianist in a memorial to the throne, prefer to reside in the city rather than in retired places, because the former is much more lucrative, and the monks are quite unable to practise self-denial. They are the very dregs of Buddhism; and, according to law, they ought all to be expelled. He proposed that all the religious establishments should be removed outside the city, and that no more than fifty persons should be allowed to reside together in any monastery. Though this petition was assented to,

yet it was found impossible to carry the regulations into force. Another Confucianist spoke of Buddha's teachings as being those of a ghost. He was called to account for this by the empress, to whom the matter was reported; and though the Confucianist quite closed the mouth of the empress, by shewing that as Buddha had once been a man, and had died, he must be a ghost, yet she fined him an ounce of gold—as a warning to others, I suppose.

In the kingdom of Chow 周, whose capital was Ch'ang-an (the modern Hsi-an-foo in Shensi), the fortunes of Buddhism were subject to great fluctuations. The first ruler established an order of precedence for the three religions—Confucianism taking the first place, Taoism taking the second, and Buddhism occupying the third place. In 574, however, Prince Wu abolished Buddhism and Taoism, sent the monks and nuns and Taoists back to common life, demolished their temples and monasteries, and destroyed their books and images.<sup>3</sup> Buddhism had already been expelled once from Wei, and had been reinstated after an interval of seven years. On the present occasion only six years elapsed until it was again in favour—so hard a task is it, as a Confucianist mournfully observes, to annihilate heresy.

At the period of Chinese history to which we have now attained—viz., the middle of the sixth century, Buddhism seems to have extended itself over nearly all the empire. Something like a religious enthusiasm, indeed, seems to have existed among the people—inspired partly by the example and teaching of Bodhidharma, partly also by the zeal of several of the princes. We find the word *Sēng*, or monk, occurring very frequently as a name—not only among professed *religieux*, but also among the laity—even in the families of mandarins. Every household almost had been converted to the faith, and the number of those who had taken the vows was so great that the labours of the field were frequently neglected from lack of work-

<sup>1</sup> See Tung-chien, &c., ch. 30. A Confucianist wanted her to repair the public buildings which had become disgraceful, instead of spending so much time and money on monasteries. The empress, however, paid no heed to the memorial.

<sup>2</sup> Tung-chien, ch. 30.

<sup>3</sup> Tung-chien, &c., ch. 35.

men.<sup>4</sup> Instead of cultivating their farms, and looking after their mulberry trees, the people were always talking about "the other bank"—that is, about the *paramitâs*, or transcendent virtues.<sup>5</sup> At the southern capital alone there were more than five hundred monasteries, all sumptuously built and furnished; while of male and female *religieux* there were more than one hundred thousand. It was impossible to ascertain the number of religious houses and their inmates throughout the country districts; but the Confucian alarmist professed to fear that unless restrictive measures were adopted every house would become a monastery, and every family would profess religion.

The chief of Sui was really master of the empire from the year 582, though the feeble dynasty of Ch'êñ in the south lingered on until 589. Wén Ti, the first of the Sui emperors, had before coming into actual possession of the empire allowed his subjects to enter religious houses; he also imposed taxes for the expenses incurred in the copying out of the sacred books and the making of images. In his old age he became a very devoted follower of Buddha, and forbade the destruction of images. At this time the books of the Buddhists far outnumbered those of the Confucianists, and religion seems to have progressed very well during the short period that the Sui dynasty endured. The last emperor, however, did not regard it so favourably, as he dismissed many monks and nuns to their homes, and caused several of the monasteries to be pillaged.

(To be continued.)

### AU SIN SHANG.

*Read before the Canton Missionary Conference.*

BY REV. R. H. GRAVES, M. D.

In the spring of 1860, when I had a chapel near the N. E. gate of Canton, a young man remained after service, and said he wished to be a Christian. On enquiry, I found that he was from Ko-ming, some 50 miles from Canton. His native district had been overrun

by the Hakkas, who have frequent and bloody feuds with the native Cantonese. During these disturbances he had escaped to Hongkong, and there first heard the gospel. Having been unsuccessful in business there, and quiet having been restored in his native place, he went home. While at home he prayed to God, day after day, that he might meet with a teacher who would tell him how to be saved. With this object in view he made his way to Canton, and was providentially directed to my chapel.

I invited him to come daily and read the Bible with me. He came for some time. Seeing his sincerity, I asked him to stay with me for a while, that I might have a better opportunity to instruct him, and to become acquainted with him.

He was the grandson of a mandarin, and the son of a secretary in a government office, was well read in native books, and had attended the government examinations. This training, together with his natural intelligence, enabled him very soon to get an intellectual knowledge of the truths of God's Word. The Holy Spirit had evidently begun a work in his soul. The vanity of earthly happiness had been impressed upon him, and he was seeking for something higher. He had, during 27 years, seen something of the world and of the vicissitudes of life, and had learned the emptiness of earth.

Being convinced of his conversion, and the relation of his experience having proved satisfactory to the church, I baptized him on July 30th, 1860.

Reading Matthew X. with him, I committed him into God's hands, furnished him with some packages of tracts, and told him to go home and confess the Lord Jesus in his native village.

In the fall of 1860 I tried to get a foothold in the country, and spent a month in a hired house at Tai-shâ, some 45 or 50 miles from Canton. Au came to me there in October, and said he wished to help me preach the gospel to his fellow countrymen. Seeing that he had natural ability for usefulness as a speaker, if his motives were pure, and he had the grace of God in his heart, I determined to test him. So I offered him a situation as my cook and servant at a small amount of wages, and promised to instruct him, and give him an opportunity to speak. I knew from his connections, and his previous social standing as a student, and afterwards as a shopkeeper, that it would be coming down for him to be a cook; but I think no man fit for the ministry who cannot give some proof of his willingness to deny himself for Christ.

Au was with me as cook for some 12 months; then I let him give his whole time

<sup>4</sup> Yuan-chien, &c., ch. 316.

<sup>5</sup> See Burnouf, *Lotus de la Bonne Loi*, p. 544.

to study and preaching, but still at a small salary, \$4 per month.

His force of character, intelligence and self possession made him a man of influence in the world; while these traits, together with his constant spirit of prayerfulness and knowledge of the Scriptures, made him a useful and reliable man in the church. He was rather distant in his behavior towards strangers, and had not that easy, winning manner which rendered Luk, who was associated with him as helper at Shiu-hing, so popular. But he had a good knowledge of human nature, and a sound judgment. He was very cautious about advising the admission of members into the church, and I had great confidence in him in this respect.

In 1862, when I was obliged to spend much of my time in Canton in consequence of the death of my colleague, Bro. Gaillard, Au was unanimously chosen by the Shiu-hing church to conduct the Sabbath services, and act as pastor during my absence. This position he continued to occupy until his death.

During the war in America I could give him but a very small salary, and he got into debt. The Roman Catholics, ever on the alert to make proselytes, and knowing Au's influence in Shiu-hing, offered him a monthly stipend nearly twice as large as I was giving him, to be a teacher of the language to a French priest. He was told that he might do as he pleased about joining their church.

He came near falling into this snare, and for a while caused me a great deal of anxiety. I warned him of the danger, and by God's grace he was kept from going astray. He said he had no intention of leaving our church, but merely wanted the employment. His great safeguard was prayer. He took everything to God, and was never disappointed in being guided aright.

In October last he accompanied me on a journey to his native district, and bore half of the expenses of the trip. When I bade him good-bye, and we parted, he to return to Shiu-hing and I to come to Canton, I little thought that we should never meet again in the flesh, but so our Heavenly Father had willed it. Soon after his return to Shiu-hing he had a severe haemorrhage from the lungs, and after lingering for nearly two months, his spirit took its flight.

During his last illness, he showed that he was indeed a trophy of divine grace.

As I was engaged in building my chapel in Canton, I could not be with him during his sickness. His last letter to me—written with a feeble, trembling hand—was as follows:

"My dear Pastor:—I am very sick, and probably will never recover. The brethren

are supporting me while I write a few lines to comfort my pastor.

"I have no grief—no fear—no anxiety. I depend with my whole heart upon my merciful Father; and trust in Jesus, my gracious Savior, for my salvation. I know it is God's will to save me, for the love of God is shed abroad in my heart. I beg my pastor to be at rest, and not to be concerned about me. Hereafter I shall certainly see you in heaven. I hope to be saved, because I am trusting in the grace of God with my whole heart."

His wife and the brethren who were with him during his illness tell me that he spent much of his time in prayer. At first he was troubled with a sense of his sinfulness, and prayed God to give him an assurance that his sins were forgiven, so that he might depart in peace. Soon after this he had a vision; he was in heaven and saw a majestic being clad in white, with brilliant, piercing eyes, much like the description in the first chapter of Revelation. But He was bowed down by an immense burden strapped to his back. Falling down on his face before Him, he cried, "O gracious Lord Jesus! those are my sins that are bowing Thee down. How canst Thou do that for me?" The Savior fixed His eyes upon him, and said, "Fear not, I have borne all thy iniquities." He took this as an answer to his prayer, and afterwards felt no doubt as to his acceptance with God.

At another time he thought himself in heaven, where he was clothed by Jesus in a snow-white robe embroidered with gold, and saw his name written in the Lamb's book of life.

One day his wife said to him, as she stood by his bedside, "I have heretofore depended on you to support my body, but on Jesus to support my soul; now I trust in Jesus to support both body and soul." He said, "I am glad to hear you say that. I was afraid your faith might fail you. Read the 14th chapter of John. I am going to one of those mansions in heaven. Love Jesus, and you will soon be there too."

After a season of unconsciousness, he was pressed to take food, but declined, saying, "I have eaten of the fruit of the tree of life; I shall not need earthly food any longer."

Au's happy death-bed has made a strong impression on those who were with him. They have seen that there is a real difference between the joy of a Christian going home to Jesus, and the stolid indifference with which a heathen submits to inexorable fate.

CANTON, April 7th, 1869.

**MEMORIAL OF YIHUNG**

*Respecting the Enshrinement of the Portrait of  
the late Emperor in the Ancestral Hall  
at Mukten. Dated, Nov. 26th, 1868.*

This memorial from Yihung contains an account of the care which the Manchu sovereigns take to preserve the records and mementoes of their family in its original seat at Mukten, and possesses additional interest from its details of the half-completed deification with which the deceased sovereigns are invested after death,—a sort of worship partaking both of an ancestral and state character, since their spirits are regarded as tutelary guardians of the empire and of the imperial clan together. It will be observed that the portrait, seals, tablets,—everything is addressed as if the departed spirit of the emperor vivified it, and accepted the worship.

Your Majesty's slave Yihung with others humbly report that they have carried out the directions given them to deposit [the sacred things] in their proper places with appropriate rites, and beg the Sacred Glance to rest upon their memorial.

Your slave and his associates received the dispatch from the Board of Rites on the 17th of October, ordering them to accompany the Holy Portrait (**聖容**) of our Literary Ancestor, the Emperor Illustrious (**文宗顯皇帝**) (i. e. the emperor whose reign was called Hienfung) with his precious Books, his personal Seals, the Records of his reign, his sacred Instructions, and the Genealogical Tablets, to Mukten, to be carefully put away; and that they should bring back to Peking the original six books of the records [of the preceding reign].

On the same day we issued the necessary directions to the clerks of the several Boards whose duties required them to act herein, to the officers of the Bannermen stationed in the city, and to the functionaries connected with the Imperial Clan, that each should hold himself in readiness in his particular post. When everything was prepared to carry out.

the orders with due care and respect, your slaves Tsingkai and Tsing-an, following the Orders given them, paraded their troops, and with Ku-ni-yin-pu and Ngan-tsz' went ahead with detachments to wait at Shan-hai-kwan at the Great Wall.

Your slaves Yihung and Olhopu, having carefully done as they had been directed, and through the Astronomical Board selected a propitious moment, did, on the 24th of October at 5 o'clock A. M., reverently and carefully ask its permission to move the sacred Portrait of our pervasive Ancestor, the Emperor Perfect (**宣宗成皇帝**) (i. e. the emperor whose reign was called Tau-kwang) from its shrine in the middle story of the Phoenix Hall to a place in the hall of ancestors, where its was set up with due rites upon a yellow altar, during the ceremonies. When the ritual had been finished, it was requested to return to its own place [in the Phoenix Hall].

Two days after this, the precious Books and Seals, the sacred Portrait [of Hienfung], the Records of his reign and sacred Instructions, and his Genealogical Tablets, were all placed in an elegant portable pavilion in the chariot, and carried to Shan-hai-kwan, where your slaves Tsing-an and the others received them upon their knees.

At this place, the princes and high functionaries detailed by your Majesty for this duty, joined them, and escorted the things to Lü-yang post-house, 閻陽驛, from whence your slave Ku-ni-yin-pu, having delivered the charge of the escort to Ngan-tu, returned to his duty at Peking.

On the 5th of November, the whole cortège reached the environs of Mukten, where your slaves Yihung, Olhopu, and others, each in charge of their own detachments of officers and troops drawn up in order, received and saluted the chariot on their knees. The ceremonies in the ornamented shed having been performed, we then reverently asked that the boxes would reenter the ornamented pavilion and lead the way into the city. Your slaves having paraded their men and place every officer in his station in the procession, at 5 o'clock P. M. of that day, reverently asked the precious Books and Seals to temporarily enter the Great Temple of Ancestors; the Sacred Portrait of our Literary Ancestor the Emperor Illustrious (**文宗顯皇帝**) to quietly ascend and rest upon the yellow altar at the right hand in the Ancestral Hall; and the Records of his reign, the Sacred Instructions, and the Genealogical Tablets, to rest upon other tables on both sides of it. All of them were in-

closed in yellow wrappers emblazoned with dragons; and your slaves stationed guards outside to watch them day and night.

On the 6th of November, at 5 o'clock P. M., the propitious hour selected by the Astronomical Board, your slaves reverently asked the precious Books and Seals to [allow themselves to] be placed in the vermilion case on the western side of the center hall in the Great Temple of Ancestors, each of them reposing in the proper order. When this ceremony was over, we asked the Records of the Reign and the Sacred Instructions to be placed in their proper locations in the alcove in the Ancestral Advice Hall. This over, we next reverently received the Genealogical Tablet in the yellow case, and carefully stored it in the first gilded Dragon Closet on the western side in the upper storey of the Phoenix Hall; and the Genealogical Tablet in the red case in the second gilded Dragon Closet on the same side.

We then asked the Sacred Portrait of our Pervasive Ancestor the Emperor Perfect still to return to its royal seat in the middle storey, where it received suitable honors and offerings; and after that we reverently requested the Sacred Portrait of our Literary Ancestor the Emperor Illustrious to rest on the northern side of the same middle storey, on top of the central gilded Dragon Closet where it received the same honors and offerings.

When these rites were accomplished, we respectfully requested those six original records to return with us to Peking, and accordingly your slaves, with the princes and high officers, escorted them to the ornamented Pavilion, in which they were accompanied outside of the city of Mukten, and changed into the royal Chariot. Your slaves Tsing-kai, Ngán-tu and Ku-ni-yin-pu then formed their respective troops in order, and carefully escorted it to Shan-hai-kwan.

I now have detailed the various steps taken in placing [these articles in their proper] locations and giving them all due honors, and send this memorial for your Majesty's information from the post-station, humbly begging for it the Sacred Glance.

*Reply.* The Board of Rites has been honored with the following Rescript:—"We have reverently become acquainted with all these particulars. From the Emperor."

In addition to this an Imperial Edict appeared on the 28th of November, approving of the above, and ordering rewards to be conferred on the officers employed, who as might be inferred were all Manchus.

His Imperial Highness SHITON, Prince Li, and H. I. Highness, TEICHANG, Prince Jui, and the others, who were designated to reverently escort the Holy Portrait of our Literary Ancestor the Emperor Illustrious, with the Records of his reign and the Holy Instructions, to Mukten, there to be worshipped with the usual ritual and placed in their repository, have now accomplished their mission.

We reverently reflect that our Imperial Sire, the Literary Ancestor, His Majesty Illustrious, whose glorious influence will be a pattern and guide for heaven and earth, for eleven years rendered such great and signal services by his labors and writings that they will form a bright exemplar for unnumbered ages. The volumes of these Records of his reign and his Holy Instructions are rich collections which will enlighten and instruct his successors to all time.

The season in which the various articles were successively sent on to our conjoint capital [of Mukten], and all the days occupied in the journey, were specially mild and agreeable; and while the ritualistic ceremonies were performing, the wind was balmy and the sun glorious in his brightness,—the whole firmament clear and effulgent. Such too was the case, when the Books and Seals, and Genealogical Tablets [of the late Emperor] were carefully placed in their closets.

Seeing, therefore, that the signs were all so propitious for carrying into effect these obligations, I look upon them as proofs of His benign favor from His heavenly seat, and accept them with great reverence and satisfaction.

To all the princes, high functionaries, and officers of lower grades, who have carried these orders into effect with such respect and care, it is meet that special tokens of regard be conferred as proofs of Our approval. Respect this.

To those who are familiar with the ideas of the Chinese respecting ancestral worship, this apotheosis of the Imperial Portrait and other things in the Hall of Ancestors, as set forth in these state papers, will present no new phase of idolatry. Every family in the Empire follows in principle the same half-deification of departed parents, and regards their spirits as the best patrons and intercessors it can have both here and hereafter.

S. W. W.

PEKING, March, 1869.

## MISSIONARIES AND THEIR CONSULS.

My thoughts have been much occupied of late with the above subject, and I send the following short paper for insertion in your valuable journal, in the hope of bringing the matter under discussion, and of eliciting the opinions of other missionaries throughout China. I would wish to say, at the outset of these remarks, that my residence in China is not of long duration, nor have I as yet had to face any of the difficulties spoken of—so that I do not dogmatize on the subject; nor do I wish to make the sweeping statement that all my brethren (many of them, too, veterans in the work) are *wrong* in pursuing the policy of Consular interference. I have my own doubts on the subject, and wish through the columns of your journal to suggest to my colleagues that *perhaps* the policy may be a mistaken one; and also wish to draw forth arguments both for and against the practice of appealing to Consular authority, in the event of persecution or annoyance arising on the part of the Chinese.

It cannot be denied that our lot has been cast in critical times. China is gradually giving up that exclusive policy which has kept her for centuries shut up to her own resources and profit. The "right of residence," so long confined to a mere strip of sea coast line, bids fair soon to be extended over the whole of the eighteen provinces. Now in this gradual extension of the right of residence, missionaries—from the very nature of their work—are almost always the first on the ground, and have already obtained a secure footing in many cities and towns of the empire, from which merchants and others are as yet excluded. It might therefore be expected, that if any determined spirit to resist foreign aggression existed among the people, it would shew itself in endeavours to prevent the missionaries from occupying any new field of labour; and so we find that the last few months have been prolific in such endeavours—accounts of persecutions, outrages, and annoyances of greater or less degrees of severity, having followed each other in quick succession. As is well known, the policy of the missionaries has almost invariably been to seek the aid of their respective Consuls; or, if the Consul did not suffice, to memorialize the Minister at Peking; and in most cases the result has been the restoration of tranquillity, and security given for the future peace by the promulgation of proclamations from the Chinese officials of the disaffected districts. Such has been the result; but what effect has this policy had upon the missionaries themselves? In my humble

opinion, not a good effect. On the one hand, you hear missionaries praising their Consul in high terms for the active and prompt manner in which he has by the strong arm of the law (aided in some instances by the stronger arm of a "man of war") repressed disturbances and persecution. On the other hand, you hear missionaries blaming their Consul in no measured terms for supposed inability or unwillingness to repress such persecution, while again you hear missionaries say, "O, let us push our treaty rights," until one is led to inquire whether we are preachers of the gospel of peace, or merely propagators of the religion of a dominant power. Undoubtedly we have treaty rights; but the question is how far are we, as missionaries of the cross, justified in appealing to them?

In approaching this question, as indeed all questions connected with our work, we ought first to ask, "What saith the Scripture?" Can we find anything either in the life of our blessed Redeemer, or of His Apostles, which will help us in this matter? There is not much; but what little we have is I conceive *against* the practice of appealing to Consular aid. There are two passages in our Lord's history bearing upon the subject of the persecutions likely to follow from the labours of the Apostles, which I will examine in order. The first occurs in Matt. 10: 23, when Jesus, sending forth His twelve Apostles to preach the gospel, among other things said unto them, "When they shall persecute you in this city, flee ye into another; for verily I say unto you, ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel till the son of man be come." Whatever interpretation we place upon the phrase "till the son of man be come"—whether as referring to his personal visitation of those cities on his itinerancies, or to the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, to which the phrase is often applied—the tenour of the whole charge evidently is this, "There is plenty of room; if the people of one city refuse to receive your doctrine, go and try another place." So that this passage certainly militates in some degree against the policy of calling in Consular aid to *compel* any given city to receive us and our doctrine.

The second passage occurs in Luke 22: 35, where our Lord bids his Apostles to sell their garments and buy swords. The Apostles took this command in its literal sense, and many since the Apostles' days have likewise gathered from this text that the civil power may on some occasions be used on behalf of the gospel. That our Lord intended no such inference to be drawn from His words is I think evident both from his after remark, "It is enough," and from his conduct

when St. Peter did really use the sword on the occasion of our Lord's capture by his enemies. The whole context shews that Jesus simply wanted to teach the Apostles that they must be prepared for persecution, and be ready to encounter such opposition as would in defence of any other cause call for the use of the sword.

But it may be said that the life of our Lord offers no parallel case from which missionaries may draw their argument; let us then turn to St. Paul, the great Apostle of the Gentiles, and true type of a missionary. It is well known that on three different occasions St. Paul appealed to his right as a Roman citizen; and his example is often brought forward when arguing on the subject of Consular aid. A slight examination, however, of the passages which speak of this appeal will shew that *on no one occasion* did he appeal to Roman Consular aid *against* the people or government of any land or city in which he met with persecution; and consequently his example does not touch our case at all. The first occasion of his asserting his rights was at Philippi. The magistrates, moved by the people, had beaten Paul and Silas, and committed them to prison, without any inquiry into their reputed crime; and afterwards, desiring to get rid of any unpleasant consequences of so unlawful an act, wished to send them away from the city as quietly as possible. As we all know, St. Paul would not permit such a disgraceful proceeding to take place; and by appealing to his rights as a Roman citizen, he compelled the magistrate to come to the prison, and publicly liberate them. On this occasion then, we see that it was *against* the Roman official that St. Paul appealed to his civil rights, and not *to* him against the people. The second occasion was when the uproar in the temple at Jerusalem took place, and the chief captain commanded the soldiers to scourge Paul. St. Paul, by informing the centurion in charge that he was a Roman citizen, compelled the soldiers to cease binding him, and also escaped the scourging. On this, as on the first occasion, the appeal was *against* the Roman official, and not *to* him. The third occasion was at Cesarea, when the Roman Governor Festus, willing to please the Jews, wished to send Paul to Jerusalem to be judged. St. Paul, knowing that this was but a subterfuge to get rid of him, made that appeal which at once took him out of the power of all provincial officials whatever, and made him amenable only to the imperial tribunal at Rome. This, although in part an appeal to the Roman Emperor against his countrymen, was really an appeal against that vacillating policy of the Roman Governors of

Judea which was so destructive of all justice. These examples, then, do not afford us much help in deciding as to how far it is lawful to call in Consular aid to repress popular outbreaks of the people, or violent opposition of heathen rulers. St. Paul's conduct however at Antioch in Pisidia, at Iconium, Lystra and Thessalonica, shews that he had constant reference to our Lord's injunction contained in Matt. 10: 23, quoted above.

Since then we can get so little positive evidence on either side from Scripture, let us glance at one or two of the dangers which, to my mind, beset the course adopted by the generality of missionaries in China.

I. It ignores to some extent the truth laid down by our Lord, and reiterated by His Apostles, that persecution must come. Going into new regions, where Satan's seat is, we ought to keep this truth prominently before us; but it appears to me to savour very much of a desire to set it aside, when we call in the aid of our men of war to repress opposition.

II. A usual complaint made against the Chinese is that they are apathetic, and this apathy is naturally a great barrier to mission work. Now do we not by this our policy tend to keep them apathetic? There cannot be a better plan for repressing active emotions among the people than by ever keeping before them the somewhat unpleasant picture of an Armstrong gun, and telling them that if they do not keep quiet they may provoke "the horrid sound" that dwells within its muzzle.

III. It will lead the Chinese to look upon our religion and great guns as inseparable—a position which all true missionaries ought earnestly to avoid bringing about. Just take a few of the recent cases. Mr. Taylor's party at Yang-chow have without doubt been established in that city at the point of the bayonet; and the guns of H. M.'s boats have said in unmistakable terms to the people, "Take care how you treat these missionaries." Then again at Foochow, the English Church Mission has come to blows with an ex-Prefect on the subject of building a sanitarium. The Prefect's house has been stormed by the soldiers, and \$10,000 "paid over as a kind of bond to keep the peace," a very Bow Street like way of settling a missionary difficulty, certainly. It may be doubted whether a missionary had not better have open enmity than a peace whose existence is a matter of dollars and cents. At Formosa, too, fighting has occurred. It is true that other foreigners were interested in the redress of this outrage; but the chief parties concerned were the missionaries. In the face of such cases as the above,

it might be difficult to convince the Chinese that "the weapons of our warfare are not carnal."

I may here anticipate one or two objections. And first, I do not intend by the above remarks to imply that on *no* occasion are we to seek redress, either from native officials or foreign Consuls; but chiefly to deprecate that spirit which is manifesting itself on all sides, to call in the aid of foreign power on *every* occasion of oppression or persecution. Again, it might be said that if such be my views, why do I procure a passport? This objection has already been made by one of those numerous cavillers against mission work whose frivolous and unfair articles find such a ready organ in the *North China Daily News*; but it does not affect the question at issue. The procuring of passports is a duty which all who enter this empire owe to the Emperor of China, irrespective of their professions; and that missionary would certainly be doing wrong who attempted to go about the country without one.

Again, it may be said that these remarks lose somewhat of their power from their being written by one who has not yet had any active persecution to encounter. This objection I can only answer by saying that I trust, if occasion offers, to apply these views to practice.

As I said at the beginning, I have written this paper chiefly with the hope of bringing the matter under discussion, and shall be thankful if I have succeeded in so doing. God has always honoured, and always will honour and own, a firm trust in His almighty power and protection; and there is a danger of placing *too much* dependence upon man, in thus appealing so frequently to Consular aid. Let it be ours to keep the medium between presumption upon His protecting power on the one hand, and distrust of His power on the other.

H. G.

HANGCHOW, March, 1869.

P. S.—Since writing the above, I have seen the reprints of several articles which appeared in the home papers on the Yang-chow affair. These articles lack none of that prejudice and ignorance which usually characterize such productions; but still, as it is allowable to learn even from an enemy, we may gain some benefit from them. The writers on the whole take the same view of Consular interference as that which I have taken in this paper, and think that for missionaries of a gospel of peace, we are too fond of the gun-boats. There is one fact which forces itself upon one's notice when reading all these articles, and it is this; whenever any of these outbreaks occur, the mer-

chants and foreign community generally partake largely of the benefits resulting from clearer definitions of treaty rights while *all* the odium of having stirred up hostile feelings in the breasts of the Chinese is thrown upon the missionaries—so that we really work for those whose only return will be a tirade of abuse. "Cui bono?"

H. G.

## OUR COUNTRYMEN IN CHINA.

*Read at the Union Chapel, Shanghai,  
January 8th, 1869.*

BY REV. C. H. BUTCHER, M. A.

The subject on which I shall have the privilege of addressing you this evening is one of primary importance; and if it fails to interest, the fault will be in the speaker, not in the subject; for no less momentous a theme awaits our consideration than the position of our countrymen in China.

Let us consider—first, their spiritual welfare; and secondly, their beneficial influence on the heathen. In order to estimate the question of the spiritual welfare of foreigners in China, let us see what religious influences are brought to bear on them at home, which are wanting here in the Middle Kingdom; and then what special hindrances present themselves in this country which are happily not found at home. We shall not discuss the subject fairly without adding some mention of the one great compensating advantage which is met with in the farthest East.

1st. What religious influences are brought to bear on foreigners at home which are wanting here in China? It is only too easy to name these. 1st, Too many of the foreign residents miss the blessed associations of home life. They arrive here at early ages. They are fresh from the kind society of friends, the vigilant love of parents, the sweet and tender ministrations of sisterly affection. What do they find instead? Freedom certainly from many restraints, exemption from some of the exacting observances which peevish age demands from impetuous youth; but this is not altogether the gain it promised to be. They find themselves thrown into the company of a knot of men with whom perhaps they have not a thought in common. The delicacy of mind which they had when they left home is soon rudely offended. Purity of thought is ridiculed as squeamishness; purity of act laughed down as babyish ignorance. It is a hard, coarse world, for one just fresh from a mother's nurturing. What wonder if in cases too many to be

named evil has its wicked way, and the sensitive, clear minded boy becomes a vulgar roue, and a witless profligate!

Of course, I am well aware it is far easier to denounce than to amend. A group of men with abounding health, strong animal spirits, no restraint, and more money than they have ever had before, are terribly likely to misuse their gifts. There are instances of a lowering in the tone of the character, a neglect of the studies that adorn and embellish life, and the acquirement of a stock of bad habits that easily and swiftly ruin the soul. But on the other hand, there are an hundred instances of firm and loyal resistance to seductive temptations, of a bold opposition being presented to Satan, and of quiet continuance in well doing amidst associates only too eager to lead astray. In this place I have, thank God, known many instances of such good fights; and I refer them to several causes. The honest hearted, Christian living youth is commonly one whose home has been cheerful—not gloomy—in its piety, whose education has been liberal and kindly, and who has a supply of intellectual resources which may afford pleasant occupation for the hours of vacancy and leisure. Need I add that those men who have best preserved their "chastity of honour" amidst the thick coming temptations of an alien land are also those over whose childhood a pious mother's care was extended, and who have hovering over them like a gracious benediction the wings of her affectionate prayers.

But there is another religious influence lacking in China which is brought to bear on young men at home. I refer to the public profession of Christianity by the outside world. England and the United States may have many grievous shortcomings to answer for. They may present public and notorious spectacles of vice which make us as professing Christian men and women ashamed; nevertheless, in those lands we have the "outward and visible signs" that the religion of Jesus bears sway. The leaven of Christ has leavened in a certain measure and degree the lump of society. The glittering symbol of the cross flashes over the porticoes of countless churches, to remind us of the atonement. The holy day of rest recurs perpetually, with its outward evidences of solemn observance, to remind us of the resurrection. In Europe and America we cannot thrust Christianity away, even if we wish to do so. Out here, all is different. Nothing reminds us of Jesus—nay, every external object in the myriad objects which constitute our daily environment reminds us of his foes. We see even in this anglicized settlement the heathen priest far oftener than the Christian minister. The paper offerings and

the tinsel ingots strew the streets. In every shop we see the unmistakeable indications that the people are "wholly given to idolatry." The chime of a church bell is rarely heard; the noise of fire offerings exploded to alarm malignant demons is constantly audible. These things seem slight, but they tell upon the characters of those to whom they are daily presented.

In the third place, religious services, and opportunities of hearing the gospel, are abundant at home, and are comparatively scanty in China. In Shanghai this remark does not apply, as every English speaking foreigner can if he likes go to his church or chapel twice every Sabbath day in this settlement. There are eight Protestant services held every Sunday in this place; so that it is absurd to speak of the lack of opportunity of hearing God's word. But we are exceptionally fortunate. At the small ports, the state of affairs is less happy. Often missionaries are found willing, at some inconvenience, to hold services for foreign residents; but at other ports the services have to be conducted by laymen, and I fear in some settlements the Sunday is spent without any public recognition of its sanctity. This neglect of a solemn ordinance must act unfavourably upon the residents. Coleridge once said to a friend on a Sunday morning, "I feel as if God had, by giving the Sabbath, given fifty-two springs in every year." How joyless must be the life of those who pass the three hundred and sixty-five days without one day of spiritual refreshment! I have often felt deeply the position of those little knots of my countrymen who are stationed at remote ports—outposts of civilization—and are deprived by the cruel necessity of their position from enjoying Sabbath privileges. On several occasions, friends in the Consular service at such ports have asked me to suggest suitable sermons for public reading on Sundays; and I have been surprised to find how difficult it is to procure appropriate ones for congregations so circumstanced. The volumes of the late F. Robertson, of Brighton, are the favourites; but many of these deal with questions that such congregations as those to which I have alluded take scanty interest in. It will be most gratifying to me to have some discourses suggested. As it is, though two million sermons are preached annually in the British Isles, I have hitherto failed to find a volume which exactly meets the case. Will any one tell me of a good volume of short, intelligent, unconventional sermons, suited for lay preachers to read to their brother laymen?

2nd. I pass to note certain special hindrances to the progress of growth in grace which present themselves in this country. I notice

first, the publicity of men's lives. The system of residing together in a joint "mess" as it is called, and the absence of facilities for retirement and privacy, are notable hindrances to the formation of thoughtful and earnest character. Many of the evils which beset naval men and military men are experienced by the merchants and assistants whose names are connected with the China trade. They are thrown constantly together. They may have uncongenial dispositions and tastes; yet meet they must, day after day, and month after month. This is a difficulty—a painful stumbling block—a "cross," to use technical language, *not* very hard to bear, because it is unfelt at first—but it is, rely on it, often very injurious to the character of the man who is perpetually compelled to submit to it with a smile.

Another hindrance that stands in front of a man who seeks to be in earnest is the absence of books. It must be remembered that we live in a peculiar age; that religious thought is expanding; and that Christianity, in order to gain any hold on a man, must be intelligent as well as loving. The wants of man are of course the old wants—as they were in the beginning, and as they shall be until our race is run; but he claims solutions of these recurring problems far more complete and satisfactory than those which sufficed for the last generation. Books then wisely selected, and in sufficient numbers to enable a student to master a subject thoroughly, are imperatively needed. In England and America, even in the smaller towns, public libraries are established, and the best works of thoughtful writers freely circulated. It would be well if some such means for diffusing knowledge were at work in this and the other foreign settlements. I hope you do not think me laying too much stress on instrumentalities which are brought to bear on the mind, rather than those which speak to the spirit. You will indeed mistake me, if you suppose I underrate those means of grace which must ever occupy the first place. But simply and practically I mean this—that if a young man has resolution enough to allot certain hours for private study, and is able to break away from the society of a circle of his equals, that he may read and think, he will soon cease to make the effort, unless such books are placed in his way as are likely to keep interest awake, to preserve curiosity alive, and to give him something better than the conversation or amusement from which he has perhaps reluctantly torn himself away. But these hindrances after all are slight, compared to the great one which seems inherent in the minds of foreign residents. I mean the besetting notion that what they do out here does not matter, as their stay is of

necessity short. This has been at the root of all or nearly all the faults of our countrymen in the Flowery Land. They have acquired the habit of thinking the present immaterial.

"Anything will do out here. When I get home I shall be able to range myself, settle, and reform. I will mend my social ways. I will pay attention to religious duties when I get back. This is a temporary sojourn—a period of foreign service soon to close." This state of mind is very pernicious. It is, to use a common phrase, a "hand-to-mouth" way of living, which is especially calculated to make men careless. To lead a life of procrastination, always deferring and deferring reformation, is obviously to lead a life which weakens the moral courage. Surely, if—as St. Paul hints—we may recognize allegorical meanings in the Old Testament narratives, we may find a deep and appropriate lesson in the story of the murmurings and falls of Israel, when on the march. Though in one sense we are strangers and pilgrims, yet it was not good for national character to be ever dwelling in tabernacles, resting for a night, and hastening on in the morning; neither is it good for us to feel that we have no deep personal interest in the place where our lot is cast, and in the sphere where the duty of the inexorable present has to be done. I am aware these remarks apply to 1859 rather than to 1869; but I regret to say they are not without a cogent application to-day. Let us strive to regard China as our home. Loyal love to our native lands, God grant we may never lose; but while we are placed by our Father's providential government in this country, let us earnestly strive to use every opportunity—to read, to pray, to join in religious services—in a word to labour with heart and energy to fit ourselves for heaven while it is called to-day; for "the present moment is eternity."

And now, having glanced at some of the hindrances which beset our countrymen in the East, let me name one great compensating advantage. We learn out here the essential "unity of the spirit" which animates Christianity. We learn how deep, and fundamental, and grand, are the principles on which we all agree; and how trifling and worthless the minor points over which contending parties wrangle at home. Out here in front of the enemy, there is no time for quarrels between the various regiments. This is a lesson the value of which cannot be estimated. It is an advantage which really compensates for almost anything. We all feel it as such. For surely, when we take up a religious newspaper—the organ of any party, or sect, or church, do we not feel it impossible to peruse the reports of the contests that

excite vivid interest at home with any particle of patience? How small the whole thing seems, in the front of the great work which has to be done out here! Thank God for residence in the East, as the best teacher of liberality, of comprehensiveness, of toleration!

The next point to which I am pledged to direct your attention is the beneficial influence of our countrymen on the heathen. Our valued friend who addressed you on Wednesday anticipated much that should be said on this head, and he spoke with the authority of experience, as one versed in the Chinese language, and so able to explain the light in which we appear to the natives. For my own part, I speak with great diffidence—fearful of giving offence, fearful of accidental misrepresentation of facts. Therefore I say little. I will only venture to recall a great principle. It seems to me that we hear far too much of the peculiarities of the Chinese mind, of the special and unintelligible modes of thought common to Chinese thinkers, of exceptional ideas, of unapprehended processes of reasoning—in effect, of a world of thought we cannot understand in every Chinaman's breast. I think this is all overrated. There is a needless mystification about a simple fact. The Chinese are human beings. They seem to me to have feelings, passions, humours, prejudices, exactly as we have. They are not all cut to a pattern. There are varieties of character amongst them—honest men, false men, generous men, niggardly men, vain men, humble men. In every house in this settlement, there are varieties of character amongst the foreign occupants. In like manner, there are varieties of character in every group or gathering of shroffs and compradores—aye, amongst the coolies who stagger under tea boxes when the thermometer is at 90°, with a string of cash for their wages. Let us act on the grand principle which St. Peter learnt at Joppa, and refrain from calling any “common or unclean.” Then all will be well with us. Whether we know Chinese, or whether we do not know Chinese, we shall prosper in our intercourse with these Eastern folk about us, and gain—soon or late—their regard and respect. Justice, purity and honour will and must be recognized. The smallest leaven of inconsistency or wrong doing will be detected with an eagle glance. Amongst the Chinese, as amongst all men made by the Father of the universe, good traits of character, sympathy, sensibility and right feeling will assuredly be found; and those will prosper best who try to discover the silver, and to separate it from the dross.

This is all I can say on this large division of a large subject. To many it may seem

trite, a mere platitude, a fact that every body knows. But do we not sometimes need to be reminded of truths we all ought to know? Is there not a perpetual tendency in the human mind to neglect and pass over the obvious, and to seek for and study the remote? Let the layman who is induced to revile his native servants and acquaintances pause, and ask himself, “Am I treating these men as I should treat my own countrymen?” If not, there is, rely on me, something wrong in his course of procedure. Let the missionary sometimes forget the professional insight he has acquired, or fancies he has acquired, into “the modes of thought” of his native converts, and be natural, and treat them as his brother men. After all, the humanity Christ took, and ennobled by taking, is the strongest bond of brotherhood. For what says Paul of Tarsus?

“For we have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image him that created him.”

“Where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free; but Christ is all and in all.”

### MISSIONARY CELIBACY.

The number for January of your ever welcome paper has just come to hand, and been read through. Being no Papist, I of course am not bound to put either my conscience or judgment in the hands of any man, or class of men; but being a Protestant Presbyterian, I regard it as showing no unnecessary disrespect to the clergy when I act as the “more noble” Berean Christians did when they heard even Paul preach—i. e., they searched the “writings,” to find “whether those things were so;” and they are commended for so doing. After having read the extract on missionary celibacy, I turned to Dr. Schaff’s deservedly popular work on the “Apostolic Church.” I confess, Sir, that my cheek burned with shame for Protestant candor, when I found that the extract was taken from a chapter in which that learned and accomplished author advocates the very reverse of Popish necessary and uniform celibacy. Will you do Dr. S. and truth the justice to insert the entire article on “Marriage and Celibacy,” as it is found in Section 112, page 448?

"Christianity then, as we meet it in the New Testament, recognizes in marriage the normal relation in which the human character fully develops itself, and answers its great end,—a relation instituted by God, and sanctified by Christ. The depreciation of conjugal life, by an asceticism which cannot rise above its physical and natural basis to the view of its higher moral and religious significance, contradicts the spirit of the gospel, and is, in reality, of heathen origin. In fact, the apostle numbers it among the doctrines of the evil spirits which rule the world of idolatry (1 Tim. 4: 1, sqq.), that they forbid marriage, as some Gnostic sects and the Manicheans did—looking on the body which was created by God, and designed for the organ of the Holy Ghost, with its sensual wants, as a part of the intrinsically evil matter, and consequently regarding all contact with it as sinful.

"In this point Christ cannot be strictly taken as our pattern; for he was not merely an individual, but at the same time the *universal* man, for which no consort at all of equal birth could be found. The church, the body of regenerate humanity, and it alone (not the individual soul) is his bride; and this relation is assuredly, as already shown, the sacred model of every true marriage.

"As to the apostles; we know certainly that Peter was married, and took his wife with him on his missionary tours. Tradition affirms the same of Philip, and gives him as well as Peter children. From 1 Cor. 9: 5, it has been justly inferred that at least the majority of the apostles and brothers of the Lord (probably sons of Joseph from his former marriage) lived in wedlock. At all events, Paul here excepts none but himself and Barnabas, while claiming the same right of marriage for himself, if he chose to make use of it. Yet ancient tradition unanimously represents St. John as unmarried. As to the subordinate officers of the church; the book of Acts mentions four prophesyink daughters of the deacon and evangelist Philip (21: 8, 9.) In 1 Tim. 3: 2, 12, Tit. 1: 6, it is disputed, indeed, wheth-

er successive or only simultaneous polygamy, polygamy proper, is forbidden. But at any rate the being "the husband of one wife," which is required of presbyters and deacons, as also the mention of their children and their own households, 1 Tim. 3: 4, 5, 11, 12, Tit. 1: 6, imply that *one* marriage is right for ministers, and, so far from censuring the married state, present it as the normal state, and as a good school for exercise in the most important duties of life." Here he gives the extract given by "Protestant" (?) headed "Missionary Celibacy," on which extract we make no remarks, unless to say that the last paragraph of it, as it appears in your journal (containing such a well deserved rebuke of the way in which "many young ministers even while students"—who knows but "Protestant" among them?—"look around for a wife"), as might have been expected from a man of Dr. Seaff's literary taste and judgment, is not found in the body or text of the "History of the Apostolic Church," but in a foot note, referred to from the words "numberless privation" in "Protestant's" extract. With the exception of the first word, "But," in the sentence with which the extract commences, "Protestant" quotes the Dr. correctly until the end of the 2nd paragraph—i. e., to the words, "I would that all men were even as myself (v. 7)," inclusive. It will be noticed that by the omission of the word "But" there is a little of that "trying to make the most of the cloth" that appeared so manifestly in "Protestant's" Lessons of Romish Missions. Let that pass, however; if Dr. S. is done no greater injustice than by the omission of that one little word, we will not complain. Connecting then immediately with the last words quoted in their proper place from the Dr.—i. e., "I would that all men were even as myself (v. 7)," the History goes on to say:—"Here undeniably that ascetic tendency and relative depreciation of marriage, which we find in almost all the church fathers, even the married ones (as Tertullian and Gregory of Nyssa), has some plausible foundation to rest upon. Yet we can-

not, without charging Paul with obscurity and inconsistency, understand him as derogating from the holiness and dignity of marriage, which in Eph. 5 he himself so decidedly asserts. The apparent contradiction may be solved by the following considerations, suggested by the connection of the passage itself:

"1. It must be remembered that in the time of the apostle the education of the female sex, and the whole married life, were in a very low state; that Christianity had scarcely begun to exert its refining influence upon them; and that the elevation, and sanctification of them, must in the nature of the case be gradual. \* \* \*

"2. The apostle plainly has in view approaching pressure and persecution, which are certainly heavier on the married than on the single, and furnish strong temptations to unfruitfulness to the Lord, from personal considerations.

"3. All this instruction on the question proposed to him by the Corinthians respecting marriage and celibacy, Paul repeatedly assures us (v. 6, 25, 40) he gives as his own private judgment, as his humble opinion (*gnome*), and not as an express command of the Lord (*epitoge*), who had given him no special direct revelation on the subject. Hence to prescribe laws on this point is to assume more than apostolical authority. The *prohibition* of marriage is expressly enumerated by the same apostle among the marks of antichrist (1 Tim: 4: 3.)

"Our conclusion therefore is, that according to the doctrine and practice of the apostles marriage is duty in general, but under certain circumstances and for certain individuals celibacy; that the latter may be as great a blessing to the church as the former; that the decision however in any particular case whether to marry or not must rest neither on the person's own will nor on another's, but on a consideration of the person's peculiar gift, and the plain indications of providence. The great work of the man remains in both cases the same—to serve the Lord, and Him alone. To do this, in whatever way, is neither greater nor less

*merit*, but our bounden duty, and should be at the same time our honor and our joy."

The first and second (1, 2,) of the above three considerations are somewhat abbreviated, but I think I can say, with a good conscience, that it has been only for the sake of brevity, not for the sake of garbling or of making "the author say what he did not mean." This can be verified by a reference to pages 453-4 of the History. With these two slight omissions, the extract which I send and that which "Protestant" has already sent form the whole, except the foot notes, of what Dr. Schaff says on the subject of marriage and celibacy. It will be borne in mind that the dispute between the Protestant and the Papist is not whether celibacy is allowable, and may be "under certain circumstances and for certain individuals" advisable; this all Protestants admit in theory and in practice. Almost all the missionary societies that are largely represented in China have some unmarried missionaries here; whether such are voluntarily or involuntarily celibates is no man's business except their own; but the point in dispute is, Is celibacy *required* of the clergy by divine appointment? What does Dr. Schaff teach on the subject? Can "Protestant" lay his hand on his heart, and say that he has treated Dr. Schaff, as Mencius—a heathen philosopher and moralist, whose opinions we came here, if not to supplant, at least to expand and improve—says men ought to treat the authors whom they quote?—"They may not insist on one term so as to do violence to a sentence, nor on a sentence so as to do violence to the general scope. They must try with their thought to meet that scope, and then we shall apprehend it." Not knowing to what casuistry men who are skilled in the school of Rome may resort, I appeal to your readers to decide for themselves whose conduct seems the more worthy of imitation—the Christian garbler of Dr. Schaff, or the heathen instructor of Héen-k'ew Mung. I am afraid that if the *Times* and *Telegraph* should notice this, they will not only not question the wisdom of mis-

sionaries coming here; but will advise us to come and take our places as humble learners at the feet of those whom we have been sent to save; and they will have too much reason for so doing. I may be mistaken, and hope I am; but I can conceive of only two reasons—one, or a compound of both, of which could induce "Protestant" to send you the article as in any wise "a sufficient reply" "to certain criticisms" on his former article:—1st, That excellent history is not yet very widely known in China; and with a feeling not at all strange to some natures, he may have thought that he would play off a good trick on your readers—as some wits endeavor to impose on the ignorant, by saying that the Bible justifies suicide, because it says, "Judas went and hanged himself," "Go thou and do likewise;" or as one of America's greatest geniuses is said to have amused his boyhood leisure hours by writing incredible and ridiculous stories about Abraham and other Old Testament worthies, and, having interleaved them in his father's family Bible, reading them therefrom to the astonishment of his devout but unlettered neighbors. I must say, Mr. Editor, that if your deservedly acceptable and well commended paper is to be made the vehicle for conveying quirks and sophistries of that kind, it will lose in that dignity and respect without which no paper, secular or religious, can be sustained on the coast of China. Let "Protestant" be content to show his rhetoric in expatiating on the advancement of the 363,000 "well instructed" Romanists in China; and others like him whose "experience has not been large" may not be able to detect his fallacies; but let him know too that he stands on an entirely different platform when he comes to speak of the teachings of Dr. Schaff. I sincerely hope however that the paper was sent, not for the reason just mentioned, but for a 2nd reason, which, though not good in itself, is yet less objectionable than the one already surmised—that is, ignorance of the context. "Protestant" may have had the extract shown or handed to him, and so sent it to you without considering

the "general scope." Would "Protestant" dare to come out before your readers over his own name, and give a plain answer, Yes or No, to the three following questions? Let it be known that we will have no quibbles or chicanery—not even a "But" misplaced. 1st, Are Dr. Schaff's teachings on marriage and celibacy unscriptural? Yes or No. 2nd, Does Dr. Schaff enjoin the celibacy of the clergy? Yes or No. 3rd. Are Dr. Schaff's teachings on the subject of marriage and celibacy consonant with the teachings and practice of the Romish Church on the same subject? Yes or No.

It is said that about the time the disciples of Loyola took their rise an apparently smart, well dressed, well educated man would commence sometimes in a fair or market to talk to the people of the new doctrines that were stirring; he would express himself strongly in favor of the Jansenists, perhaps of Luther and his sect. After some time a country, plain dressed man would come forward to ask somewhat more minutely about the doctrines; the first speaker would give such information as was asked, and would be led on to acknowledge faults in the doctrine and morals of his professed patrons which they would not have tolerated for a moment; or he would seek to excuse their faults, that he had acknowledged, by palliatives that only made their "confusion worse confounded," till at last having, according to previous appointment with his apparent opponent, exposed to ridicule and derision the cause that he had falsely endeavored to uphold, the poor fellow, Jesuit though he was, had actually to flee from the jeers and hoots and brickbats that his casuistry had called forth from the disciples of his own school, his fellow vassals of the Pope. I believe the order is not entirely dead yet; but they were a very insinuating, sly people, and often found where they were not suspected.

S. D.

HANGCHOW, March, 1869.

## THE ORIENTALISM OF RUSSIA.

BY F. PORTER SMITH, M. B.

The tendency and relation of "Holy Russia" is to the East the stronghold of superstition, as well as the starting-point of the wise men of old. Not all the homilies of the "dailies" and "quarterlies," nor the precautions of Indian Viceroys, can prevent Russia from making a wide house in her natural home. Long before western nations had been able to obtain representation in Peking, Russia had there her important "Mission." She is slowly absorbing the unimproved territories of the northern parts of the Chinese Empire, by virtue of the common descent of the tribes of Siberia, Manchuria, &c., from the old Tungusic stock. Her merchants sell much good cloth, and buy largely of tea, in the interior districts of China, practically forbidden to the traders of other unfavoured nations. The Inspector General of Customs vainly endeavours to regulate the profitable trade which Russian merchants carry on at the miscalled "barriers." Russia is the friend, or rather of the kindred, of China; and her steamers and gunboats are found upon the Amoor and the Yang-tsz-kiang, in increasing force.

Russia and China have both elected to abide by that despotism which even Turks are forsaking. Better to let Russia pass by Osman Constantinople, and take care of the Mongols and real Turks in Eastern Asia, in revenge for the devastations of their country by the armies of Temugin, in the earlier part of the thirteenth century. The Russians have as much dread and reverence for "Our Lord the Czar" as the Chinese have for "The Son of Heaven."

It is upon this superstitious allegiance that both sovereigns, heads of their national hierarchies, mainly depend for the ruling of their wide realms. It is bad to be enslaved in body and state, but worst and vilest of all to be enslaved in mind, by superstition.

If any wish to be informed what this means, let them read Romanoff's "Sketches of the Greco-Russian Church."

To quote an instance, just as the Chinese have deified the smallpox, that Attila of the host of diseases, as a goddess, *T'ien hwa, sen mong*, 天花聖母, and speak of this disgusting disease as "the flower from heaven," or "the felicitous circumstance" (喜事), so the Russians speak of theague as their "friend," or "neighbour," or their "joy." It is said by the Russian "cunning women" to be a spirit to be frightened, or coaxed away with fine and deceitful words.

Similarly, the Chinese deem theague to be produced by a ghost; and for fear of offending him, they do not speak of themselves as suffering from the stroke of theague, but as *pang kung*, 帮工, or busy at work.

Other instances might be found of identity of superstitious observances practised by these allied nations, whose future relations are of the deepest interest to western diplomats.

HANKOW, March, 1869.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### THE SATURDAY REVIEW ON MISSIONARIES.

DEAR SIR:—

As the missionaries are prevented by their profession from coming forward in their own defence against the uncalled for attacks which it seems to be the fashion for the moment to make upon them, I may perhaps be excused obtruding a few remarks on the article against them in the *Saturday Review*. This attack—light, yet bitter—the last and happiest production of the pen of the chief support of the *Reviler*—will be a matter of surprise to none. A line of opposition to the missionary body is what the paper is paid for, and its readers would cease to support it, did it uphold either decency or religion; but it must have somewhat astonished its admirers that, assaulting a body of power and respectability, it should not have been able to find weapons of greater weight; and that seeking to crush a band numerous and fearless, it should be unable to do so in any other way than by the invention of a fable of a chignon.

For, after all, what does the article amount to? That the Taylor mission appraised their losses at some £600, and that among the things claimed for was a hair ornament valued at £25, supposed by the *Reviler* to be a chignon.

There is no evidence that it was. There is, on the contrary, every evidence that it was not; but rather some trinket—a cross, perhaps, left to its possessor by some dear friend, possibly her mother—valuable comparatively speaking, but worth to her far more than the dollars recovered from the despoilers—irreplaceable—a souvenir recalling the days of infancy and those lessons of early youth which germinated and bore fruit in the abnegation of self, and the embracing of a life of privation and devotedness in China.

And if it were a chignon, the mission of female missionaries in China is certainly as much to civilize as to convert. It is for them

to gain a footing and an influence in the families of the listeners to the truth; to raise and elevate the women of China to the position their sisters enjoy in foreign countries; and to make them the wives, and not the despised companions merely of their lords; and they will most indubitably fail in this, if they are not fit and ready to take their places in the ranks of their own society, when brought in contact with it. Chignons are absurd, objectionable, detestable; but they are the fashion; and, so long as they are so, any woman desiring to avoid singularity will wear them, at whatever discomfort to herself; for to be singular is to be unfeminine, and to be unfeminine is to lose all power, all charm, all influence. The Chinese probably make merry on the subject of chignons generally, but they are keen observers, and they would look with suspicion and distrust on an eccentrically or unusually dressed female, even though the omission of the chignon was her only neglect.

And for the other charge, that they appraised their losses—what else would they do? Their property even was not their own. Certain things were needful for the establishment of a European society in the midst of a Chinese city. These things were provided by certain supporters of the mission—Mr. Taylor and his band being but the stewards for its administration; and when a lawless mob had destroyed this property, would Mr. Taylor have done his duty to those who sent him out, had he refused to state its value, when called on by the authorities, to enable them to make the excitors of the tumult feel their responsibility? A concertina and a sedan chair seem extraordinary to the writer at home, but to people out here who know the necessity of chairs, and to missionaries who know the utility of some musical instrument to assist the psalmody which is one of the charms of our services, it will be an evidence that Mr. Taylor's mission approached apostolic simplicity in its appointments, that one chair only, and a humble musical instrument only, were the extent of its possessions.

The charge of luxury has often been brought against missions in the east, but never with such little justice as against Mr. Taylor and his companions. Poor, unfeasted, unbacked by a powerful society at home, they had no opportunity, even had they had the inclination, for excess; and my readers will not require to be told that life in the heart of a Chinese city, surrounded by the smells which alone come to perfection there, dressed in Chinese costume, and occupied in mastering the language, or arguing with Chinese on the doctrines of their and our faith, cannot be a gay one. But no! for

years and years the mission haters have abused the Protestant missionaries for not going into the interior; and now they do so, the cry is at once that they must be confined to the ports. A few months ago, I remember hearing it objected to the Taylor mission that their way of living, dispensing with the ordinary comforts—almost necessities—of European life, would give the Chinese unfavorable ideas respecting the civilization we are ever boasting; and now they are represented as pampered Epicureans; wantoning in a single sedan chair, and revelling with Sardanapalian concertinas.

Fortunate it is that the missionaries have an end in view which renders them indifferent to the report of men; and that doing their work faithfully, it recks them little whether they be considered by the world of the category of princes or that of green-grocers.

Your obedient servant,  
ARTHUR CHALONER.

## A FEW PRACTICAL ANSWERS TO “A FEW PRACTICAL QUESTIONS.”

“1. Is it right under any circumstances for members to part with their children to heathen?” This question hinges chiefly on the question whether the first duty of a parent to his child be the salvation of its soul, or the nourishment of its body; whether it is better that the child should die a Christian, or live exposed to the danger of a relapse into paganism. A Christian who murdered his newly baptized infant would not be held excused that he did so to prevent the child being exposed to the attacks of sin if it lived; and there is little difference between allowing a child to die of starvation, when it is possible to obtain food for it, and using violence upon it. Besides it is doubtful whether the introduction of Christian infants into heathen families is not desirable. The little maid led to the conversion of Naaman; and the infant Samuel, when he could lisp only, was a tool in the hand of his Maker.

“2. Does the money given and taken for children render the transference a matter of buying and selling?” In no way can this be considered in any light but that of buying and selling. It is a conditional sale, but still a sale; and as it would seem impossible for a parent to release its child from its natural duty to him, it is even obtaining money without giving the consideration.

“3. Can any plan be devised for abolishing the system of bringing up girls in the same home with the sons of the families to

whom they are to be married?" I see not the force of the objection to the practice.

"4. Is the custom of servants, in purchasing goods for their masters, to charge more than they have paid, allowable?" If understood and recognized, yes—that is to say, if the servant is paid small or no wages, on the understanding that he is to get a commission on purchases; but if not allowed, it is simply robbery, and comes under the 8th commandment.

"5. Is there any legal rate of interest, beyond which in lending money our members ought not to go?" I opine there is no rate ruling over the whole of China. The prohibition in the Bible is against usury, by which I understand taking advantage of a man's necessities to squeeze interest out of him, beyond the possible product of the loan. In England, where money will not produce more than 6 or 7 per cent., 5 or 6 is the highest interest you can lawfully charge; but in China money so varies in actual value that no rate can be laid down, but the question can in any individual case be readily settled by conscience. If the money lent is to produce 20 per cent. it would not be usury to charge 15 per cent. for its use; but if 5 per cent. only is to be the out-turn, then 10 per cent. could not be charged without sin.

To go on to "Enquirer's" questions:—

"1. Ought Chinese Christians to be allowed to purchase and use in their families female slaves?" If the slaves be purchased for emancipation, and then only, should Christians, Chinese or other, be allowed to purchase them.

"2. Should members of native churches be disciplined for working, for buying and selling, and for travelling, on the Sabbath?" Undoubtedly, if the church holds these acts contrary to its belief, it cannot consistently allow Chinese converts to break the commandments.

"3. What evidence of conversion should be required of Chinese candidates previous to baptism and admission to the ordinances of the church?" For baptism, the evidence that was required by Philip of the eunuch, by Paul and by the apostles of those baptized by them—a profession of faith, and an application for the sacrament. For admission to the Lord's table, the same evidences of true repentance that are required of Europeans.

"4. Should Chinese church members be allowed to use samshu as a beverage, and when they invite guests?" If it be held that teetotalism is essential to godly life, certainly not; for samshu differs in nothing essential from whisky. But if the practice of our Lord be taken—who, at the wedding feast,

shewed conclusively that wine is not forbidden—then I can see no reason why the use of samshu should be denied the native convert.

"5. Is the use of foreign (port) wine indispensable to the proper celebration of the Lord's Supper?" It is not held to be so by even the Romanist church, and there can be no doubt that the apostles did not use the wines now generally employed when they administered the Supper of our Lord.

"6. Should a Chinaman who is in the habit of taking opium be received into the Christian church?" Received, yes; for there is nothing to forbid a sinner coming to the Lord just as he is; but it would be evident, that if the conversion were sincere, the member of the church would gradually, if not immediately, give up opium-smoking and other bad habits.

"7. Is the use of tobacco by Chinese Christians compatible with the scriptural declaration that the 'body' of a Christian is '*the temple of the Holy Ghost*'?" Excessive use of tobacco would doubtless be as objectionable as excess in anything else. There is no special reference to tobacco in the Bible, and until the question of the effect of tobacco on the system be satisfactorily settled, no answer can be given this query. If its use be invariably injurious, a good Christian would never take it; but if it be, as alleged by many, beneficial when consumed in moderation, then he who rejects it would be in the position of Peter, when he rejected the providing of the Lord as unclean.

ARTHUR CHALONER.

## THE USE OF THE CHARACTER 而.

SIR:—

Many enquiries having been made in Europe respecting the quality of the Chinese character 而 when preceding a verb at the end of a sentence, and it having been denied that there is an equivalent of this form of construction in any of our Western languages, I take the liberty of sending you a few sentences taken from a work entitled, "Het Gezantschap der Néerlandtsche Oost-Indische Compagnie aan den Grooten Tartarischen Chan den tegenwoordigen Keizer van China, &c., &c. Antwerpen, A. D. 1666."

On page 215 we read:—1. "Dat zij zoo gek niet en ziju," that they are not so foolish—lit., that they so foolish not and are.

2. "Uyt haar senige slaap-kaamer en koomen," to come out of their only sleeping apartment—lit., out of their only sleeping apartment and come. *Ibid.*

3. "Dat hij hetzelfde geensins en kreundt," that he does not at all trouble himself about it—lit., that he in no wise *and* disturbs it. *Ibid.*

4. "Nog niet bekend en zijn," not yet known—lit., not yet known *and* are. P. 218.

Compare with these sentences the following Chinese:—

1. **自遠方而來**, coming from afar—lit., from afar *and* coming.

2. **安然而死**, to die peacefully—lit., peacefully *and* die.

3. **卒爾而對**, hastily replied—lit., hastily *and* replied.

The similarity of form of construction in both languages is so obvious as to require no further comment. "*And*" [而 and en] is merely an expletive. In this form of construction the Chinese denominate 而 a 轉折之字—i. e., an expletive—it being only used for the sake of rhythm, and rarely, if ever, to give force to the verb or predicate of the sentence. For further information on the use of 而, see my Grammar of the Chinese Language, p. II.

W. LOBSCHEID.

VICTORIA, May 15, 1869.

## The Chinese Recorder AND MISSIONARY JOURNAL.

Rev. S. L. Baldwin, Editor.

FOOCHOW, JUNE, 1869.

### BIRTHS.

At Canton, April 8th, 1869, a daughter to Rev. E. J. ETEL, of the London Mission.

At Foochow, May 8th, 1869, a daughter (BESSIE MAY) to Rev. NATHAN SITES, of the American M. E. Mission.

### DEATHS.

At Peking, April 3rd, 1869, HELEN AUGUSTA, youngest daughter of Rev. W. H. COLLINS, of the Church Mission, aged one year and three days.

At Shanghai, May 6th, 1869, AGNES EMILIE, daughter of the Rev. GEORGE SYDNEY and EMILIE OWEN, of the London Mission, aged 2 years and 11 months.

The RECORDER for April was sent To all ports south of Foochow, per Stmr. Yesso, May 2nd.

To all ports north of Foochow, per Stmr. Fenella, May 13th.

To England, with the March number, per Mail of May 13th from Hongkong.

To America, per P. M. Steamer of May 19th from Shanghai.

### GREETING.

We send forth the first number of our new volume with hearty expressions of gratitude. First, we are grateful to the gentlemen who have kindly acted as our Agents, and through whose efforts a large increase in our subscription list has been secured. Secondly, we are grateful to our subscribers for their hearty support, which enables us to supply them with a valuable paper at a very low price. Thirdly, we are grateful to our contributors, whose articles give the paper all its value. Fourthly, we are grateful to our contemporaries of the secular press for their kind notices of our successive issues; and we take this opportunity to express our hearty admiration of the ability displayed in the editorial management of the China press, and of the thorough manner in which it discusses the live questions of the day. On missionary questions, and occasionally on a question of morals, we are compelled to differ from most of our contemporaries; yet we can see how, from their stand-point, they view such matters as they do. So much the worse for the stand-point, however. For our own part, we have no sensitiveness in regard to their criticisms on the methods and results of missionary labor. We much prefer that they should say what they think, rather than use flattering expressions, which they at heart would repudiate. Finally, we are grateful to the Missionary Board in whose service we are for their resolution to allow us to continue the publication another year, without any interdict from them.

The RECORDER is now an established "institution." If, at any future time, it should be decided that the present occupant of the editorial chair cannot continue to fill it, consistently with his other duties, some one will be found to take his place. A periodical so entirely in harmony with the interests of the missionary work, and so strongly demanded by the unanimous voice of the missionaries of China, will not be allowed to come to an end, for want of an editor. Then, "with good will to all, and malice toward none," we enter cheerfully upon our second volume, bespeaking for it the same generous treatment which was on all hands accorded to the first.

Our subscribers will take notice that no number is published this year under date of May. We begin with June, and the volume will end with May. It is our intention, if possible, to publish each number always on or before the first day of the month in which it is dated.

---

### THE HOUSE OF LORDS ON MISSIONARIES.

---

On the 9th of March, the House of Lords discussed briefly the question of missions in China. The discussion gave occasion for a most lamentable display of ignorance on the part of some of the members of that noble body. The Duke of Somerset seems to have been the chief mouthpiece of anti-missionary sentiment in the debate. His opening question—"What right have we to send missionaries to the interior of China?"—was incidentally answered by the Earl of Clarendon, who observed,

upon the authority of Sir Rutherford Alcock, that the right existed under the French treaty—referring to the right of residence undoubtedly. The right to travel with passports, and to preach anywhere in the empire, has never been denied, that we are aware of, since the treaties were signed. It may be well just here to mention a fact connected with the articles in the treaties providing for the toleration of Christianity. Some years ago, we heard Rev. J. P. Durbin, D. D., Secretary of the American Methodist Episcopal Missionary Society, state to a public audience, on the authority of the Hon. Wm. B. Reed, U. S. Minister to China, that the clauses in the treaties tolerating Christianity were inserted at the instance of the Chinese commissioners, who stated that the Emperor, recognizing the moral and benevolent character of Christianity, would cheerfully provide for its toleration. Mr. Reed further said that none of the foreign ministers were authorized by their governments to insist on the toleration of Christianity; so that for such toleration we were indebted solely to the Chinese government. It appears, then, that Christian missionaries coming here to preach the doctrines of Christianity are pursuing their calling at the invitation; and under the authority, of the Emperor of China. And as the ruling powers at home have lately contracted a great fondness for settling all matters by appeals to the central authority, we may expect that they will vigorously remonstrate with the Peking government against allowing the Emperor's proffer of protection and encouragement to Christian missionaries being so outrageously abused by some of his unruly subjects, as in the Yangehow and Formosa cases.

But to return to the Duke of Somerset. He proceeds to "make history" in the following manner:—

"An adventurer calling himself a follower of Jesus raised a great mob, attacked and took several towns, forced the young men to join him, and massacred the women and children. When at the Admiralty I saw many officers who gave an account of the state of towns that had been visited by these so-called followers of Jesus, and nothing more horrible could be conceived. No wonder, then, that when missionaries appeared, calling themselves by the same name, the feelings of the people were excited; and it is most unjust that the English naval power should be used to support them."

Now, in view of the fact that it has never been asserted that any supposed identity of the missionaries with the rebels, or any discovered similarity between them, was the occasion of the Yangchow outrage, the rhetorical sentence we have just quoted from the noble Duke dissolves into nothingness, like "the baseless fabrie of a vision." Why should his Grace take so much trouble to invent a theory to account for the attack, when the real facts are perfectly apparent? Hostility to foreigners, as such, on the part of certain literati who fomented the disturbance, was plainly the *animus* of the whole affair.

His Grace further on takes up the stale slang about "propagating Christianity with gun-boats." Suppose the Duke should be shipwrecked on the coast of Formosa, taken possession of by some of the natives, an attempt made to burn the house he should be put in, and one of his eyes jabbed with a sharp weapon; and suppose that the British authorities should exact prompt reparation for such treatment—would that properly be called propagating the British system of nobility by gun-boats? Hardly; and yet with just as much reason as to denominate the reparation exacted in Mr. Taylor's case "propagat-

ing Christianity with gun-boats." It may be said that, in the supposed case, the Duke does not go to Formosa to propagate his notions of nobility. But we must bear in mind that it was not because Mr. Taylor propagated Christianity that his party was assaulted. It was because they were foreigners, and they must be got rid of. This fact makes the cases parallel. It is not a question of propagating Christianity, but of securing the rights of British subjects, as such.

Again, the noble Duke says, "My noble friend (the Earl of Clarendon) is quite right in saying that Christianity can only go in the wake of civilization and progress." Here we must say that both of our noble friends are quite wrong. They have transposed the nominatives and the objectives in the case. They should have said, "Civilization and progress can only go in the wake of Christianity." If England has any civilization and progress to bring to China, they are the result of her Christianity. In the days when Odin and Thor were worshiped, England could not have helped China very greatly in the line of progress and civilization. No, noble Sirs! Christianity is not accustomed to travel in the wake of anything. It is the leading, moving power of the age; and even those who underrate and seek to destroy it are indebted to it for the light which they abuse.

As his Grace draws to a conclusion, he becomes "anxious to know what chance we have of reducing these missions, or, at least, of not allowing them to go still further up the country." None, may it please your Grace—not the slightest imaginable chance! You might possibly make a coalition with Satan and some other powers to that effect, and hinder temporarily the progress of missions; but it would be a barren and unworthy success, and eventually your schemes would come to naught. The banner of Immanuel will yet float in all the Eighteen Provinces, and the Duke of Somerset may as well be reconciled to the fact.

His Grace makes the astounding statement that "nobody is responsible for

this mischief but the London Missionary Society." Why, the London Missionary Society had no more to do with it than the man in the moon. A little careful study of missionary matters would greatly add to the Duke's qualifications for speaking on such subjects. His closing suggestion about sending British subjects out of a country, where they have as much right to be as the Duke has to his place in the House of Lords, shows as great a disregard of constitutional law, as his whole speech shows of the real facts of the case which was made the occasion for its utterance.

The Earl of Clarendon, in his reply to a letter from the directors of the London Missionary Society, which reply he quoted in full in his speech, says:—"The missionaries will do well to follow in the wake of trade when the people have learnt to see in it material advantage to themselves, rather than seek to lead the way in opening up new locations." The noble Earl seems to be oblivious of the fact that nearly all the missionary operations of the century—certainly, all the most successful ones—have been carried on on precisely an opposite rule. Missionaries have uniformly found the influences that cluster around commercial centers unfriendly to the propagation of truth; and have been most successful in pushing into the interior, away from the marts of trade. To this fact, Africa, India, Burmah, China, and the islands of the sea, all bear abundant testimony. It is somewhat remarkable that the noble Earl should think that an experience of "material advantage to themselves" would be a good basis for the introduction of Christianity among a people. This certainly would give a color of truth to the charge of mercenary motives, so often even now urged against Christian converts.

The speech of the Bishop of Hereford comes in like a light shining in a dark place—a few rays of truth that were sadly needed in the midst of the gross darkness that seemed to cover the venerable assembly. Plainly stating the case in its true light—that British subjects are entitled to protection, as such

—whether traders or missionaries—whether dealing in cotton or Bibles—he stripped the subject of the verbiage which had "darkened counsel," and brought it out into the light of common sense and sound reason. His suggestion that if missionaries had never been allowed to become "troublesome," neither the noble Duke nor himself would have been a Christian at the present day, was well put. His inquiry of the Earl of Clarendon, as to the kind of trade in the wake of which missionaries were to follow was admirable—"Should he wait till the beneficent influence of fire-water or opium had made the people more amenable to the preaching of the Gospel, and then preach to men whom the trader had demoralized or intoxicated with his liquor or his vices?" We are sure that every missionary will thank his lordship for the noble speech he made on that occasion.

We regret that the Earl of Shaftesbury, in stating the fact that the missionaries at Yangchow were "in no way connected with the great missionary societies of England, such as the Church Missionary, London Missionary, Wesleyan, or Baptist societies," spoke of them as "those who had raised this fuss," and said that the great societies referred to should "be exonerated from the charge which had been *justly* brought against that small independent body." We have not as yet seen a particle of evidence that any charge of misconduct can be justly brought against the missionaries in question; and the remarks we have just quoted are unworthy of the noble Earl who uttered them, and tend in some degree to detract from the hearty indorsement he gave to the Bishop of Hereford's speech.

The London *Times*, in commenting on the debate, shows its usual anti-missionary spirit. It says ditto to the Duke of Somerset, as follows:—"The missionaries are certainly the most imprudent, perhaps the most wrong-headed of men. They have gone out with not much learning, and still less knowledge of mankind." Now, those who have observed the course of missionaries on the field, instead of looking at

them from London, through an inverted telescope, after the manner of the *Times*, have given quite a contrary testimony; and it is almost universally acknowledged that missionaries generally act in a very prudent way—that any instances of the opposite course are the exceptions, and not by any means the rule. As missionaries come to the field young men, they may perhaps not claim to have "much learning," though it would be difficult to show that they are, either in that respect, or in a "knowledge of mankind," behind other new comers in China; while it may be safely asserted that no class makes more rapid advancement, after arrival here, in these regards.

The statement that "they rush into controversy with, perhaps, the most lamentable ignorance of the character, the attainments, the tone of thought of those whom they would convert," is utterly without foundation. On the contrary, missionaries have ever been the most patient students of the "character, the attainments, and the tone of thought" of the Chinese; and the *Times* would do well to consult Dr. Williams' "Middle Kingdom," Dr. Legge's "Chinese Classics," and the many articles contributed by missionaries to local and foreign periodicals on these very topics, in order to improve its own understanding of them.

One thing should be constantly remembered—viz., that all this talk is wide of the case in hand. No want of "learning," no lack of "knowledge of mankind," no rushing into "controversy," had anything to do with the Yang-chow outrage.

But we have no more space for this subject; and in regard to the whole tenor of the article in the *Times*, we cannot do better than to use the words with which the *Saturday Review* closed its remarks on another matter—"We have no hesitation in saying that such writing as this can only be characterized as a disgrace to the nation which—most falsely we feel sure in this instance—the *Times* claims to represent."

P. S.—Since the above was written, the mail has arrived with the news that the Formosa difficulties have been dis-

cussed in the House of Lords, where the Duke of Somerset again laid all the blame on the missionaries—ignoring the camphor troubles, the killing of a merchant's servant, and the gross insult offered by the Taoutai to the Acting Consul. The Earl of Clarendon announced that the Acting Consul would be recalled, and an apology made to the Chinese government! It seems inconceivable that a government fully acquainted with the circumstances of the case could take such a course; and we have no words to express our amazement at the tidings. But our limited space forbids further remarks.

#### EDITORIAL ITEMS.

—Subscription lists for the new volume have been received from Tientsin, Chefoo, Tungchow, Kiukiang, Hankow, Ningpo, Amoy, Swatow, Hongkong and Canton. Will our agents kindly accept this general acknowledgment, and save us the trouble of writing to each personally? Our hearty thanks are due for the large increase of subscribers at nearly every port.

—Statistics of Missions have been received from Tientsin, Kiukiang, Ningpo, Foochow (except the Church Mission), Amoy (except the London Mission), Swatow, Ta-kao, Hongkong, and from the "China Inland Mission." They will be published in our July number, if those still behind come in in time.

—Our thanks are due to Rev. J. Edkins, Drs. Kerr and Dudgeon, Rev. Messrs. Blodget, Ashmore and Dodd, and to "X." for favors, which will be soon inserted. We regret that Rev. F. S. Turner's third article on the "Best Method of Presenting the Gospel to the Chinese" came to hand a little too late for this number. It will appear in our next.

—Our publishers have issued in pamphlet form the able and interesting paper of Mr. Wylie on the Bible in China, which was published in our October and November numbers. They will be glad to supply all orders for the same at the rate of ten cents per copy.